

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 30, 2008, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 4 and 10-11 are rejected by the Examiner. With this response, claims 1 and 10 have been amended. Thus, claims 1, 4, 10, and 11 remain pending in this application.

Claim 1, 4 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants submit the amendments to claims 1 and 10 overcome the rejection. Applicant respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,069,678 to Sakamoto et al. (hereinafter "Sakamoto") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,328 to Shin et al. (hereinafter "Shin") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,459,465 to Lee (hereinafter "Lee").

The rejection of claims 1, 4 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of Shin and further in view of Lee is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 1 recites an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including "the pixel electrode and the common electrode are disposed on the same layer, the common electrode and the common line are disposed on layers different from each other so that the common electrode is connected to the common line through a contact hole, the pixel electrode and the common electrode being disposed on the passivation layer." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

In the claimed invention, the common electrode and the pixel electrode formed on the passivation layer so that the common electrode and the pixel electrode are disposed on the same layer.

However, this structural feature of the claimed invention is not shown in Shin. Shin merely discloses “The counter electrode 15 comprises a wiring part 15a made of opaque metal, spaced from the gate bus line 12 and parallel thereto. The wiring part 15a is disposed on the insulating substrate 11 and connected to the wiring part of adjacent unit cell, like the gate bus line 12. The data bus line 13 is electrically isolated from the wiring part 15a by a gate insulating layer. In addition, the counter electrode 15 has at least one branch 15b connected to the wiring part 15a through an insulating layer.” See, Column 3 lines 8-16.

That is, in Shin the branch 15b (corresponding to the common electrode of the claimed invention) of counter electrode 15 is disposed on the gate insulating layer. Thus, although the the branch 15b of counter electrode 15 and the second part 16b (corresponding to the pixel electrode of the claimed invention) of the pixel electrode 16 are disposed on the same layer, these electrode is not disposed on the passivation. Therefore, Shin fails to teach or suggest at least “the pixel electrode and the common electrode are disposed on the same layer, the common electrode and the common line are disposed on layers different from each other so that the common electrode is connected to the common line through a contact hole, the pixel electrode and the common electrode being disposed on the passivation layer.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claim 4, which depends therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Independent claim 10 recites an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device having a combination of elements including “wherein the pixel electrode has a predetermined width and is substantially parallel to the first and second common electrodes and the pixel electrode and the common electrode are disposed on the same layer, the pixel electrode is disposed between the first and second common electrodes and between the second common electrodes, the pixel electrode and the common electrode being disposed on the passivation layer.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 10 for the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants’ arguments with respect to claim 10 are equally applicable to claim 1, and Applicant

respectfully submits that claim 10 and claim 11 which depends from claim 10, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: January 29, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant